

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the subject application as amended herein is respectfully requested.

Objections to the drawings and the '112 rejections

The Examiner has objected to the drawing and to the specification for failure to illustrate and describe the subject matter of claims 17-22. The Applicant respectfully traverses this objection. The Examiner is directed to review Figs. 5 and 6 and the description on pages 24-26 of the specification. As discussed in the specification, disc 70 of Fig. 5 includes a special series of signals that can be detected as the disc is spinning in the clockwise or counterclockwise direction. They include bits which such as 0's and 1's arranged in a predetermined pattern. For example the bits can form of series of 2 0's followed by 2 1's followed by 3 0's followed by 3 1's and so forth, when the disc is spinning in the right direction. When a player reads this series, it can be determine whether the disc is spinning in the right direction or not. Thus, the symbols of claims correspond to the series of 0's and 1's discussed. Therefore it is respectfully submitted that the subjects of claims 17-22 are fully disclosed in the drawings and therefore no correction is required.

PRIOR ART REJECTION

The claims stand rejected as being obvious over various references. The Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Briefly, the present application pertains to a double sided optical disc, such as a DVD disc. As explained in the application, a problem with double sided discs is that if one of these discs is inserted into a player, the player cannot read it unless it receives some indication or command to specify in which direction should the disc be rotated. There are several solutions for resolving this problem. One solution claimed herein is to provide an indicia that includes the required information in a machine readable format. As discussed above, Figures 5 and 6 provide some examples of machine readable indicia that may be used for this purpose.

The Examiner takes the position that most of the claims are obvious over Murai over Masuda. The Applicants do not agree with this assessment but in the interest of advancing the prosecution of this application, the claims have been amended to further distinguish the invention over the prior art. More specifically, claim 15, recites that the direction indicia include bar codes. The Examiner has not rejected this claim over the prior art. Accordingly, claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of this claim.

In addition, claim 20 has not been rejected over the prior art. Therefore this claim has been cancelled and its limitations have been incorporated into independent claim 7.

Claim 17 has not been rejected over the prior art. Therefore it has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 1.

It is respectfully submitted that the claims are fully supported by the specification and the drawings and as amended each claim includes subject

matter not rejected over the prior art. Accordingly it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is now in condition for allowance.

The Commissioner hereby is authorized to charge any fees that may be required in connection with the addition of the new claims to the Firm's Deposit Account No. 07-1730.

Respectfully submitted

GOTTLIEB, RACKMAN & REISMAN, P.C.

Dated: 08.02.2007



Tiberiu Weisz, Esq.
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 29,876

S:\TW\time-warner-wea\3053-66fam.doc